Manitoba
First Nations
Casino Project

Selection Committee Report and Recommendations

Committee Members:

Martin H. Freedman, Q.C.
Ron Nadeau

May 31, 2000

Manitoba First Nations Casino Project

Selection Committee

Report and Recommendations

May 31, 2000

100-06956/

Selection Committee
Suite 1508-155 Carlton Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 3H8

Manitoba
First Nations
Casino Project

Telephone (204) 945-1711
Toll free 1-877-411-4672
Fax (204) 948-4692

May 31, 2000

Hon. Ron Lemieux
Minister responsible for
The Gaming Control Act
Room 314, Legislative Building
450 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 0V8

Dear Minister Lemieux:

Since its appointment in December 1999, the Selection Committee has worked to ensure the selection of the highest quality casino proposals submitted in response to the Request for Proposals (RFP) published on January 19, 2000.

The Selection Committee's recommendations are made in keeping with its terms of reference, as determined by the Government of Manitoba and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, and with the terms and conditions outlined in the RFP, in particular Part III, Proposal Contents and Evaluation Process.

In submitting our recommendations for the establishment of five First Nations casinos in Manitoba, the Selection Committee has prepared the enclosed report which details the assessment and selection process. As well as recommending specific proposals, the Selection Committee has also commented on certain factors that will be important in converting the proposals into economic benefits, job creation and development opportunities for Manitoba First Nations people.

In concluding its responsibilities, the Selection Committee notes that while its activities cease with the submission of this report, the acceptance of any or all of its recommendations signals the beginning of a lengthy and complex process required for the successful implementation of the selected casino proposals. The Selection Committee emphasizes the necessity of continuing cooperation among the proponents, the Government of Manitoba, the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and other stakeholders.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Freedman, Q.C.

Ron Nadeau

Table of Contents

1. Meeting the Objectives – Process 1

2. Casino Project Background 4

3. Assessment Process 11

4. Recommendations 16

5. Ensuring Success 21

6. Final Comments 26

Appendices 28

1. Meeting the Objectives - Process

In December, 1999, the Government of Manitoba and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs jointly established the Manitoba First Nations Casino Project Selection Committee. The Selection Committee was mandated to select up to five First Nations destination gaming facilities in Manitoba that clearly demonstrated the ability to fulfill the objectives of the First Nations Casino Project. These objectives are stated to be:

- To ensure that the Casino Project provides sustainable economic benefits and opportunities to the First Nations people of Manitoba;
- To act as a catalyst for economic development for the host community and surrounding area and communities;
- To provide revenues to all First Nations in Manitoba;
- To promote tourism and hospitality industries;
- To create jobs; and
- To provide substantiation of mitigating measures to address social impacts which may occur.

In fulfilling its mandate, the Selection Committee worked within a framework to govern its own activities. This framework guided a complex process which included the publication on January 19, 2000 of the RFP, the response to requests for clarification or

additional information, the assessment of submitted proposals and the final selection and recommendation deliberations.

Throughout the submission and assessment process the Selection Committee was aware of the public interest which surrounded the Casino Project. In order to ensure fairness among proponents and so as not to jeopardize or compromise the submission and assessment process, the Selection Committee carried out its mandate strictly within the RFP's terms and conditions.

Specifically, the Selection Committee focussed its assessment process exclusively on the contents of the proposals as submitted by the March 31, 2000 submission deadline. Third party comments or public expressions not included with the proposals were not taken into account (we comment later on the issue of public concern). The recommendations contained in this report are based on the review, assessment and evaluation of the contents of each of the proposals as submitted.

The RFP established the criteria, terms and conditions that governed the proposal preparation, submission, evaluation and recommendation process. Copies of the RFP were available to interested parties from the release date of January 19, 2000 through to the conclusion of the Selection Committee's activities. Nearly 500 copies of the RFP were sent out.

Following the submission of proposals from 12 Manitoba First Nation proponents, either as individual First Nations or consortium groups, the Selection Committee implemented its assessment process outlined in detail in Section 4, "Assessment Process". The First Nations proponents are listed in Appendix A.

2. Casino Project Background

a) The Bostrom Report

A provincial review of gaming in 1995 had declined to examine First Nations gaming and had recommended an independent review of the subject. The Government of Manitoba appointed a committee in 1997, chaired by Mr. Harvey Bostrom, to review native gaming activities in Manitoba. The Bostrom Report (1997) gave advice and recommendations to the Government of Manitoba aimed at determining the future of First Nations gaming in Manitoba. In the fall of 1999, the Government of Manitoba announced its intention to select up to five First Nations destination gaming facilities in the province. This decision was based on recommendations made in the Bostrom Report.

The Bostrom Report recommendations served as the guiding principles for the Government of Manitoba, and its partner in this initiative, the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, in establishing the Manitoba First Nations Casino Project. The recommendations in the Bostrom Report included a framework for the Project's objectives and the casino proposal selection process, as well as detailing the scope of First Nations casinos, the applicable legislative and regulatory framework and aspects related to the conduct, management and operation of the casino properties.

The Government of Manitoba determined that the Casino Projects' revenue (net of prizes and operating costs) would accrue to the First Nations people of Manitoba. In January, 2000, the Selection Committee was advised that the Chiefs Committee on Gaming of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, had accepted a First Nations casino revenue sharing formula that provides 70% of net profit to the host First Nation(s) and 30% of net profit to a First Nations Casino Trust Fund (with 27.5% to be distributed to First Nations, and 2.5% to the First Nations Addictions Foundation).

b) The Selection Committee

The First Nations Casino Project Selection Committee was established jointly by the Government of Manitoba and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs in December, 1999. Mr. Ron Nadeau was named to the Committee by the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs. Mr. Martin Freedman, Q.C., was named to the Committee by the Government of Manitoba. This two-person Selection Committee was charged with the responsibility of selecting up to five First Nations casino proposals which met the criteria and objectives agreed to by the Government of Manitoba and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, as recommended in the Bostrom Report, and as articulated in the RFP.

On January 19, 2000, the Selection Committee published an RFP which solicited the submission of proposals for the development and operation of casino facilities by Manitoba First Nations. The RFP was sent to all Manitoba First Nations and Tribal Councils, to invite submissions in accordance with the document.

A news release was also issued announcing the publication of the RFP. The RFP was also available to the public throughout the process. A brief addendum to the RFP was issued on February 22, 2000.

The RFP outlined the terms and conditions governing the activities and requirements of the Selection Committee, including the timetable for requests for clarification and information, responses to the requests, the submission deadline and the date for the completion of the review and recommendations. Each of these deadlines was met by the proponents and by the Selection Committee.

The RFP also detailed the proposal contents requirements, including the mandatory requirements for participation.

c. *Mandatory Requirements*

There were three mandatory requirements stated in the RFP to be applicable to any proposal:

1. The proponent must be one or more Manitoba First Nations Governments;

2. The casino facilities must be located on reserve land before they will be authorized to operate; and

3. The proponent and participant(s) must comply with the regulatory framework and meet the eligibility requirements set out in Part I of the RFP. Part I of the RFP details the purpose of the RFP and the Project's objectives; identifies matters related to competition and project sites; sets out the scope of the casino proposals; establishes the "manage and conduct" requirements stipulated by the Criminal Code of Canada; outlines the regulatory framework; and discusses operational and revenue sharing matters.

d) Proposal Contents

Part III of the RFP, Proposal Contents Requirements, sets out the substantive requirements for a complete proposal. This section identifies seven component areas as follows:

1. Identification and Qualification of Proponents – this section requires the disclosure of detailed business, financial and partnership information related to all proponents and participants associated with the casino proposal.

2. Evidence of Host First Nation Government Support – this section requires demonstrated First Nations' community support for the casino proposal project.

3. Response to Adjacent Local Government Input – this section requires the proposal to demonstrate that all reasonable and material concerns of adjacent local governments have been dealt with. Efforts taken by the proponents to minimize any expected impacts should also have been indicated.

4. Location/Description of Gaming and Other Related Facilities – this section requires the proposal to include a description of the proposed project, both in narrative and illustrative detail. This includes: site planning and zoning requirements; the identification of the process required to have the proposed site set apart as reserve land as required; project budget costs for financing, construction, furnishing, equipping and operating the casino property; facility components related to the gaming activities, food and beverage services, parking and other customer amenities; and ancillary developments such as hotels, recreational facilities, conference facilities and entertainment venues.

5. Business Plan – this section requires the proposal to detail matters related to operations, marketing, projections and financing.

6. Assessment of Impact on Existing Gaming Facilities – this section requires the proposal to include a detailed market assessment based on other gaming activities, including casino operations, charitable gaming events and VLT operations, offered within the casino's market area.

7. Economic Benefits – this section requires a demonstration of how the proposal would satisfy the overall objectives stated in the RFP. Proponents were expected to detail direct and indirect benefits related to economic development opportunities, job creation, industry spin-offs and impacts of ancillary developments.

It should be noted that Part III of the RFP also states that:

> *"The Selection Committee will favour those proposed developments that will provide a catalyst for economic development (jobs and other additional benefits)."*

Following the publication of the RFP, the Selection Committee began to establish its assessment and evaluation criteria, based on the requirements in the RFP, for the anticipated proposal submissions. The details of this process are outlined in Section 4, "Assessment Process".

Prior to the submission of the proposals, the Selection Committee received 185 questions seeking information or clarification on matters related to the RFP. The responses to these requests were prepared by the Selection Committee and a complete set of all questions and answers was provided to all those who indicated their interest to the Selection Committee.

The Selection Committee maintained the confidentiality of those seeking information or clarification by excising any identifying information. The requests generally related to financing arrangements, operational and regulatory matters, site planning, customer amenities and casino project scope.

Early in March, the Manitoba Gaming Control Commission (MGCC) issued its background investigation requirements for personal and business investigations related to the regulatory aspects of the Casino Project. The information was requested to be submitted by proponents directly to the MGCC by the submission deadline.

By the submission deadline, 2:00 p.m. CST, March 31, 2000, the Selection Committee had received proposals from 12 First Nations proponents, either as individual First Nations or consortium groups. The proposals were opened and officially recorded by the Selection Committee at 3:00 p.m. the same day.

3. Assessment Process

At the outset of the process, the Selection Committee determined that its processes and recommendations would be guided by the principles of fairness, impartiality, consistency and reason. In carrying out its responsibilities, the Selection Committee, as well as the individuals and organizations providing support and assistance, worked to ensure that the process was not compromised in any way. The confidentiality of the submissions made to the Selection Committee was maintained, and the criteria established for the assessment and selection process were applied in the same way to all proponents. The Selection Committee is confident that its recommendations are reflective of its stated principles.

The Selection Committee directed the establishment of an assessment team to provide assistance, expertise and analysis in diverse areas relevant to the submissions made in response to the RFP (see Appendix B). The individuals and groups comprising the assessment team spent many hours analyzing different aspects of all the proposals. They provided expertise in the areas of finance, business planning, marketing, casino operations, tourism, intergovernmental relations, capital project planning and construction, regulatory requirements, security, legal considerations, economic benefits and social impact assessments.

The majority of these persons were seconded to the Selection Committee from eight provincial government departments or organizations. As well, the Selection Committee utilized the services of a number of members of Deloitte & Touche LLP, chartered accountants and business advisors, with a special focus on the financial and business aspects of the proposals, and on certain gaming-related matters; the full-time services of Eric R. Luke & Associates Ltd., an experienced Canadian gaming consulting firm; and the full-time services of Elizabeth Stephenson, a senior official with the MGCC.

The Selection Committee established the primary criteria for each assigned assessment task with the expectation that each individual and organization would apply its own expertise and experience to the proposal assessments. The assessment team and advisors carried out comprehensive reviews and analyses of each proposal. For most of these individuals, this was a full time undertaking. At the same time, the Selection Committee conducted its own review of each of the submitted proposals, including its own assessment of each proposal.

Upon the conclusion of that phase of the assessment process, the members of the assessment team provided detailed analyses based on the direction given by the Selection Committee. Then, guided by the project's stated objectives, the Selection Committee evaluated each proposal against the evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP, Part III, B., "Evaluation of Proposals".

The nine evaluation criteria are described in the RFP as follows (the RFP states that they are listed not necessarily in the order of importance):

1. Relevant corporate development experience and expertise;
2. Relevant executive development experience and expertise;
3. Strategic and operational business plans;
4. Financial strength and capacity;
5. Knowledge of relevant Manitoba markets;
6. Market assessment and potential negative impact on existing gaming facilities within the same market;
7. The degree to which the proposal satisfies the economic benefit objectives of the Casino Project;
8. The degree to which the project generates casino profits and how they will benefit First Nations peoples; and
9. The commitment of proponent First Nations governments and participants to comply with the provisions of the Criminal Code respecting gaming.

In conducting the final phase of the review, the Selection Committee matched the requirements necessary for a complete proposal, outlined in Part III, Proposal Contents Requirements, with the Evaluation of Proposals, Evaluation Criteria listed above. All proposals were evaluated completely and on a consistent basis. The Selection Committee did not establish a short list as part of the evaluation process.

The Selection Committee assessed each proposal according to two generally distinct set of criteria. One analysis focussed on the "business case", which took into account the important factors for the successful establishment of a casino operation. Any proposal recommended had to establish a strong case for a viable and potentially successful business operation. In summary, the major components of a "business case" are the strategic and operational business plan, which includes the proposed location of the casino, the experience of the proposed managers and of the proponent(s) and participant(s) and the financial strength and capacity of the proponent(s) and participant(s).

The other analysis focussed on the "economic benefits case", which took into account the potential net economic benefits accruing to aboriginal and non-aboriginal stakeholders. Any proposal that established a strong business case also had to demonstrate significant economic benefit (which factor was to be favoured in our recommendation). The major components of an "economic benefits case", are the direct and indirect benefits and jobs involved in the construction and operation of the facility, the catalytic effect of the casino on other developments and the benefits projected for First Nations people.

The economic benefits were considered on a net benefit basis, i.e., after taking into account reasonably anticipated adverse competitive impact on other gaming operations within the same market.

These various factors are outlined more fully in the RFP.

Based on a thorough, individual, as well as comparative evaluation of all 12 proposals submitted in accordance with the RFP, the Selection Committee reached its recommendations for the selection of five First Nations casino sites in Manitoba.

4. Recommendations

The Selection Committee recommends the establishment of five First Nations destination gaming facilities in Manitoba. This represents the maximum number permitted by the RFP.

In making this recommendation, the Selection Committee notes that the First Nations Casino Project is a business project – with sustainable economic success as the necessary condition for the achievement of the stated objectives. Further, the Selection Committee notes that it was directed by the RFP to "favour those proposed developments that will provide a catalyst for economic development . . ."

As noted in the Bostrom Report, proposals were expected to produce widely varying responses depending on the proponent's individual strengths, creativity, corporate vision, past experience and capabilities. Furthermore, the qualitative and quantitative aspects demonstrated by each proposal were important.

Based on the assessment and evaluation process, the Selection Committee is of the opinion that each of the selected proposals contains a sound business plan for a destination gaming facility that, properly developed and operated, should meet the Project's objectives. Each of these proposals is reflective of market realities and demonstrates appropriate and reasonable business planning. Each presents a sound and

complete "business case". These proposals also demonstrate a sound "economic benefits case". The facilities should provide sustainable economic benefit to First Nations people, act as a catalyst for economic development, create jobs, promote tourism, and achieve the other stated objectives.

While certain other proposals met some or most of the Project's objectives, these five are most likely to achieve all of the objectives. They represent a balance in terms of geographic location, which is a central factor in assessing the likelihood of success in a competitive environment.

For these reasons, the Selection Committee has determined to recommend the maximum number of gaming facilities permitted by the RFP.

The recommendation by the Selection Committee for the establishment of five casinos does not necessarily mean that each of the five proposals will become a reality, even if the Government of Manitoba accepts the recommendation. There will be a very significant amount of work to be done and conditions to be satisfied before any proposal is transformed into a functioning facility, and many obstacles must be overcome for a proposal to materialize as a destination gaming facility. It is possible that in any particular case some of these obstacles will be too great for a proponent to overcome. We detail some of the challenges facing proponents in Section 6, "Ensuring Success".

The following proposals, listed in order of priority (as required by our terms of reference determined by the Government of Manitoba and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs) are recommended as best meeting the stated objectives of the RFP:

- **Swan Lake First Nation**

  Sole proponent proposal: Swan Lake First Nation

  Site: Headingley – proposed conversion to reserve.

  Proposal: "Red Sands Resort and Casino", development of a 22,000 square foot casino, including 300 slot machines and 30 tables, as well as a 120 room hotel and conference centre. Proposed investment is approximately $51 million.

  Operations Management Participant: Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority

- **Aseneskak Company**

  Consortium members: Chemawawin First Nation, Grand Rapids First Nation, Marcel Colomb First Nation, Mathias Colomb Cree Nation, Mosakahiken Cree Nation and Opaskwayak Cree Nation.

  Site: Opaskawayak Cree Nation (near The Pas) – located on existing reserve.

  Proposal: "Aseneskak Casino", development of a 20,000 square foot casino, including 177 slot machines, eight gaming tables and customer amenities. Proposed investment is approximately $4.6 million (excluding electronic gaming equipment).

  Operations Management Participant: Lake City Casinos Limited

- **Sioux Valley First Nation**

  Sole proponent proposal: Sioux Valley First Nation

  Site: Rural Municipality of Sifton (40 km west of Brandon; alternative site proposed for City of Brandon) – proposed conversion to reserve.

  Proposal: "Valley Casino Resort", a multi-phased development of a 17,000 square foot casino, including 300 slot machines and 12 gaming tables, ancillary customer amenities, a 75 room hotel, entertainment centre, RV park and a golf course. Proposed investment is approximately $31.5 million (excluding electronic gaming equipment).

  Operations Management Participant: Spirit Lake Tribe (North Dakota)

- **Brokenhead River Resort Inc.**

  Consortium members: Brokenhead Ojibway First Nation, Hollow Water First Nation, Little Black River First Nation, Poplar River First Nation, Little Grand Rapids First Nation, Pauningassi First Nation and Bloodvein First Nation.

  Site: Brokenhead Ojibway First Nation (off highway 59, near Lake Winnipeg) – located on existing reserve.

  Proposal: "Brokenhead River Casino Resort", a multi-phased development, including an 18,500 square foot casino, with 300 slot machines and 30 gaming tables, as well as a 50 room hotel, ancillary customer amenities and a seasonal entertainment facility. Proposed investment is approximately $25 million.

  Operations Management Participant: Carnival Resorts and Casinos

- **Nisichawayasihk Cree Nation**

  Sole proponent proposal: Nisichawayasihk Cree Nation

  Site: Thompson – proposed conversion to reserve.

  Proposal: "Weposkaw Sipi Casino", development of a 13,500 square foot casino and ancillary customer amenities, including 200 slot machines and 10 gaming tables. Proposed investment is approximately $14.2 million .

  Operations Management Participant: Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority

Three of the recommended proposals are for casinos on land that is off-reserve. In accordance with the RFP, the casinos must be located on reserve lands before they will be authorized to operate. The mechanism to convert is complex. It involves various levels of government, it may involve public hearings and it will require the negotiation and completion of Municipal Development and Services Agreements as part of the process.

5. Ensuring Success

The First Nations Casino Project is a business initiative with a significant social policy component. Like all business initiatives and endeavours, the success of any particular proposal will depend on the sustainable economic viability of the venture. The Selection Committee has recommended those proposals that best demonstrate the qualities of sustainable economic viability. They are the proposals most likely to satisfy the social policy factor and yield the economic benefits referred to in the RFP and envisioned by the Bostrom Report.

The Casino Project is unique, and in some ways far more complex and multifaceted than many, more elaborate business projects. For example, matters related to treaty land entitlement and land conversion add significant complications to the casino development project implementation process. Moreover, the business of owning and operating a casino is quite different from almost any other. The core of the business is tightly regulated, by both civil law and criminal law.

As the RFP indicates, management of the casino operation as a whole must be provided by the proponent, but the operating mind regarding the actual gaming activities (i.e., slot machines and tables) within the casino, by law is required to be the Manitoba Lotteries Corporation (MLC). The MLC will own the gaming equipment, but it must be paid for by the proponent. The proponent manages the casino, but must enter into an

operating agreement with MLC, whereby MLC oversees the management of the gaming activities.

Significant revenue is generated from activities that would be illegal, unless they are conducted strictly in accordance with applicable statutes. Related and ancillary amenities and facilities, such as hotels, restaurants and shops, are less strictly regulated, and may be managed by the owner, without MLC involvement.

In the course of the due diligence activities undertaken as part of the assessment and evaluation process, the Selection Committee identified certain factors that it views as vital to the successful implementation of the proposed developments.

A casino project will be a success when it generates the economic benefits contemplated by the RFP, all of which will benefit First Nations people and some of which (such as spin-off benefits) will also benefit other Manitobans. For a casino facility to achieve this success there must exist the three fundamental ingredients we noted earlier; namely, a sound business plan for a casino in a suitable location, expert management and sufficient financial resources. Other factors will be important, perhaps very important, but these three are the "sine qua non"; success is not possible without them. The recommended proposals appear to have these three essential ingredients.

Like any business plan, these proposals contain a mixture of fact, projections, promises and expectations. A myriad of issues to be dealt with exist regarding each proposal, as is to be expected. How these issues are resolved probably means that the end result will not look the same as the proposal, but this is normal in moving any business plan from paper to production.

Among the many matters that have to be considered, by both the proponents and the Government of Manitoba, and which should be dealt with in the comprehensive agreement we recommend below, are:

- ensuring all phases of an approved proposal are committed and developed;
- ensuring capital costs are set at reasonable levels, and are controlled during development;
- ensuring the optimal mix of debt and equity financing;
- ensuring no overloading of charges on non-arms' length aspects of the project (e.g., lease rates);
- ensuring transactions that affect the 70/30 split (e.g., sales of assets) are carried out at fair market value;
- ensuring that any jurisdictional issues that may exist because of the unique status of First Nations (e.g., building codes, employment standards) are adequately resolved;

- ensuring that all legally required public processes relating to zoning, the environment and to conversion of land to reserve status are fully satisfied; and
- ensuring that proposed commitments to affected charities are implemented.

Owning and operating a casino is a unique and valuable privilege, hitherto in this province restricted to the government. We think it is in the public interest that the Government of Manitoba take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that at all times in the development and operation of these unique, privately-owned gaming facilities, each successful proponent satisfies two standards: first, that its casino project is developed and operated in all respects in the manner proposed or as agreed upon in negotiation; and, second, that in its operation of the casino it complies fully with all aspects of the applicable law and regulations.

We strongly recommend that a comprehensive agreement be entered into, by each proponent and the appropriate Minister, that would outline in detail the obligations of the proponent in terms of the development (in all phases) and the operation of the casino. It would deal with the various issues we have referred to above, and would also deal with negotiated or required amendments to any proposal. Moreover, this agreement would provide a means by which Government and the proponent can mitigate adverse impacts which may result from the establishment of these casinos.

The comprehensive agreement would also spell out the consequences for the casino should there be non-compliance in any material respect, whether in the developmental or the operational phase. We think such an agreement, entered into as a condition of approval of a casino, and useful and important for many purposes, is likely to ensure substantial compliance with applicable law and regulations. This agreement would be separate from the operating agreement which must be negotiated with the MLC.

It is possible that individuals and businesses that originally applied to the MGCC for business and personal background investigations in this process may differ from those who eventually comprise the proponent/participant relationship. Final approval for operations should be subject to all proponents, participants, financial participants and partnership agreements receiving MGCC clearance once participation in the project is confirmed. Compliance with the law and regulations will also require notification to MGCC of any change of any proponent, participants, financial participants, partners, directors or other individuals involved with the project and eventual casino operations.

As stated in the RFP, and as required by the Criminal Code of Canada and the Manitoba Lotteries Corporation Act, it is a requirement that the MLC "conduct and manage" gaming, as defined in the Criminal Code of Canada, at the proposed casinos. The proposals were required to include a commitment to this framework. This mandatory requirement is important in ensuring compliance with all laws and regulations on a continuing basis. Such an understanding should be included in the comprehensive agreement referred to above.

6. Final Comments

The factors noted in the previous section demonstrate the necessity for ongoing government involvement with the First Nations Casino Project. As noted earlier, the Selection Committee recommends a comprehensive agreement with each successful proponent. We think this is a necessary protective measure. The Government of Manitoba may wish to consider amendments to the existing legislation to ensure that the implementation of the successful proposals is facilitated wherever possible and also to give legislative sanction to the comprehensive agreement concept, including to the consequences of non-compliance with such agreement.

The public has an interest in the location and operation of casinos. Some members of the public have expressed their views on this matter. We conducted our assessment within the scope of the RFP, as required. We have not, therefore, factored in publicly expressed views that were not included as part of any proposal. Taking into account such views is the role of government. The Government of Manitoba will undoubtedly consider the views of the public, as well as the views of proponents and all other stakeholders, in deciding whether and on what basis to proceed with any one or more of our recommendations.

This First Nations Casino Project presents Manitoba First Nations with a unique opportunity for economic growth and sustainable development in an industry hitherto limited to government owned gaming facilities in Manitoba.

In submitting this report and recommendations, the Selection Committee is satisfied that it has selected the proposals of the highest quality for destination gaming facilities that, properly developed and operated, should bring about significant economic benefit and opportunity for the First Nations people of Manitoba and meet the other objectives of the First Nations Casino Project.

APPENDIX A

The First Nations Casino Project proponents (listed alphabetically) and the proposed casino locations, are:

- **Proponent:** Aseneskak Company, representing Chemawawin First Nation, Grand Rapids First Nation, Marcel Colomb First Nation, Mathias Colomb Cree Nation, Mosakahiken Cree Nation and Opaskwayak Cree Nation. **Site:** Opaskawayak Cree Nation (near The Pas).

- **Proponent:** Brokenhead River Resort Inc., representing Brokenhead Ojibway First Nation, Hollow Water First Nation, Little Black River First Nation, Poplar River First Nation, Little Grand Rapids First Nation, Pauningassi First Nation and Bloodvein First Nation. **Site:** Brokenhead Ojibway First Nation (off Highway 59, near Lake Winnipeg).

- **Proponent:** Buffalo Point First Nation. **Site:** Buffalo Point First Nation (south east corner of Manitoba, on Lake of the Woods).

- **Proponent:** Dakota Tipi First Nation. **Site:** Dakota Tipi First Nation (near Portage La Prairie).

- **Proponent:** Long Plain First Nation. **Site:** Long Plain First Nation (near Portage La Prairie).

- **Proponent:** Nisichawayasihk Cree Nation. **Site:** Thompson.

- **Proponent:** Peguis Indian Band. **Site:** Rural Municipality of St. Andrews.

- **Proponent:** Roseau River Anishinabe First Nation. **Site:** Emerson.

- **Proponent:** Sioux Valley First Nation. **Site:** Rural Municipality of Sifton (40 km west of Brandon, alternative site proposed for City of Brandon).

- **Proponent:** Swan Lake First Nation. **Site:** Headingley.

- **Proponent:** Waywayseecappo First Nation. **Site:** Waywayseecappo First Nation (near Russell).

- **Proponent:** West Region Tribal Council, representing Waterhen First Nation, Rolling River First Nation, Pine Creek First Nation, Gamblers First Nation and Ebb and Flow First Nation. **Site:** Dauphin.

APPENDIX B

The Selection Committee wishes to thank the following individuals and organizations for their assistance and expertise in the assessment process:

Mr. Norman Asselstine
Vice-President Casino Operations
Manitoba Lotteries Corporation

Mr. John Borody
Chief Executive Officer
Addictions Foundation of Manitoba

Mr. Jan Collins
Development Consultant
Culture, Heritage and Tourism

Ms. Susan Darvill
Project Manager, Casino Development
Manitoba Lotteries Corporation

Ms. Laurie Davidson
Director, Municipal Financial & Advisory Services
Intergovernmental Affairs

Deloitte & Touche LLP

Eric R. Luke & Associates Ltd.

Mr. Wilf Falk
Chief Statistician
Manitoba Bureau of Statistics

Mr. Dale Fuga & Staff
Registration, Enforcement & Licensing
Manitoba Gaming Control Commission

Mr. David Greenwood
Assistant Director
Manitoba Bureau of Statistics

Mr. Gord Hannon
Crown Counsel
Manitoba Justice, Civil Legal Services

Mr. Rick Josephson, & Senior Management
Manitoba Gaming Control Commission

Mr. Joe Keszi
Policy & Development Consultant
Culture, Heritage & Tourism

Mr. Steven Kupfer
Assistant Deputy Minister
Accommodation Development, Government Services

Ms. Mary McGunigal
Crown Counsel
Manitoba Justice, Civil Legal Services

Ms. Elizabeth Stephenson
Director of Research
Manitoba Gaming Control Commission